



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Am

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,364	03/22/2001	Jonathan Paul Sharp	01064	2366

23338 7590 06/02/2005

DENNISON, SCHULTZ, DOUGHERTY & MACDONALD
1727 KING STREET
SUITE 105
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

HUTTON JR, WILLIAM D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2179

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/817,364

Applicant(s)

SHARP, JONATHAN PAUL

Examiner

Doug Hutton

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 29-33 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Applicant's Response

In Applicant's Response dated 7 February 2005, Applicant amended Claims 1, 16-18, 27 and 28, added new Claims 29-33, and argued against all objections and rejections previously set forth in the Office Action dated 5 August 2004.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the term "a" should be inserted between the terms "into" in Line 7 and "destination" in Line 8 so that the limitation is grammatically correct.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-13, 15-20 and 22-28 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ramsay et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,230,135.

Claim 1:

Ramsey discloses a method for converting an electronic document interchangeably between a format for use in a Braille environment and a format for use in a word processor environment (see Figures 1-5; see Column 1, Line 1 through Column 10, Line 43; specifically, see Column 7, Lines 9-18), including:

- receiving input in a first of the environments specifying the electronic document (see Column 2, Lines 3-10; see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that it discloses a word processor, a word processor with a Braille keypad, and other interactive computer Braille devices);
- storing the electronic document in an intermediary file format (see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that it includes a computer having a word processor and a computer having a word processor with a Braille keypad, and other interactive computer Braille devices; word processors store documents in an “intermediary format” in that it converts the documents to either ASCII or Unicode when storing the documents); and
- converting the electronic document from the intermediary file format into a destination file format adapted for editing in the second of the environments (see Column 2, Lines 3-10; see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the tactile communication

method discloses this limitation in that discloses editing the stored document using either a word processor or a word processor with a Braille keypad), wherein the intermediary format specifies the document formatting in at least one of the environments (see Column 2, Lines 3-10; see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that it discloses both a word processor and a word processor with a Braille keypad, and other interactive computer Braille devices; a word processor stores documents in an “intermediary format” in that it converts the documents to either ASCII or Unicode when storing the documents; the stored document may be viewed in a word processor or “read” on the receiver; thus, the document is stored in an “intermediary format” that specifies the formats for both the Braille environment and the word processor environment).

Claim 2:

Ramsey discloses the method according to Claim 1, further including transferring the document to an apparatus adapted for operation in the second of the environments (see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that the document is sent to the receiver so that the user can “read” the document).

Claim 3:

Ramsey discloses the method according to Claim 1, further including rendering the electronic document in the second of the environments in accordance with the

specified formatting (see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that the receiver allows the user to “read” the document).

Claim 4:

Ramsey discloses the method according to Claim 3, further including editing the electronic document formatting for one of the environments (see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that it includes a computer having a word processor; word processors allow document formatting to be edited by users).

Claim 5:

Ramsey discloses the method according to Claim 4, wherein editing the electronic document in one of the environments does not affect formatting of the rendered electronic document in the other of the environments (see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that it editing the document in a word processor would not affect the formatting of the document that is rendered in Braille format because the document is converted from a word processing format to a Braille format after it is edited).

Claim 6:

Ramsey discloses the method according to Claim 1, wherein the input is received in a Braille environment from a Braille keyboard, standard keyboard or a stored

computer file (see Column 2, Lines 3-10; see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that it discloses word processors with Braille keypads).

Claim 7:

Ramsey discloses the method according to Claim 6, wherein the destination format is adapted for use in a word processor environment (see Column 2, Lines 3-10; see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that it discloses word processors with Braille keypads; thus, the document is created in a Braille environment and the “destination” environment is a “word processor” environment).

Claim 8:

Ramsey discloses the method according to Claim 1, wherein the input is received in a word processor environment from a standard keyboard or a stored computer file (see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited text).

Claim 9:

Ramsey discloses the method according to Claim 8, wherein the destination format is adapted for use in a Braille environment (see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the

Art Unit: 2179

tactile communication method discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited text).

Claim 10:

Ramsey discloses the method according to Claim 7, wherein the destination format is compatible with word processing equipment to assist in creating, editing rendering and/or printing a text document (see Column 2, Lines 3-10; see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that a “word processing” format is compatible with word processing equipment, and word processors are used to create, edit, render and print a text document).

Claim 11:

Ramsey discloses the method according to Claim 9, wherein the destination format is compatible with Braille equipment to assist in creating, editing, rendering and/or embossing a Braille document (see Column 2, Lines 3-10; see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that it renders the document in a Braille format and discloses word processors with Braille keypads that allow a user to create, edit or render a Braille document).

Claim 12:

Ramsey discloses the method according to Claim 9, wherein the destination format for use in a Braille environment specifies the electronic document for rendering in grade 1, 2 or computer Braille (see Column 1, Line 49 through Column 2, Line 10; see Column 7, Lines 9-18; see Column 8, Lines 46-49 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that it thoroughly discusses rendering documents several different grades of Braille and it renders the document to the receiver in “computer” Braille).

Claim 13:

Ramsey discloses the method according to Claim 7, wherein the destination format for use in a word processor environment specifies the electronic document for presentation on a word processor (see Column 2, Lines 3-10; see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that it discloses a document in a “word processor” format that tells the computer how to properly format the document when it is displayed in the word processor).

Claim 15:

Ramsey discloses the method according to Claim 1, wherein the electronic document formatting is specified by codes indicating page layout, character attributes and the like (see Column 2, Lines 3-10; see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the tactile

communication method discloses this limitation in that it includes a word processor that specifies the document's page formats and text formats).

Claim 16:

Ramsey discloses a method for converting an electronic document interchangeably between a format for use in a Braille environment and a format for use in a word processor environment (see Figures 1-5; see Column 1, Line 1 through Column 10, Line 43; specifically, see Column 2, Lines 3-10 and Column 7, Lines 9-18), including:

- receiving input specifying an electronic document from an input device operating in the Braille environment (see Column 2, Lines 3-10; see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that it discloses word processors with a Braille keypad, and other interactive computer Braille devices);
- storing the electronic document in an intermediary file format which specifies the document formatting in both the Braille environment and the word processor environment (see Column 2, Lines 3-10; see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that it discloses both a word processor and a word processor with a Braille keypad, and other interactive computer Braille devices; a word processor stores documents in an “intermediary format” in that it converts the documents to either ASCII or Unicode when storing the documents; the stored document may be viewed in a word processor or

“read” on the receiver; thus, the document is stored in an “intermediary format” that specifies the formats for both the Braille environment and the word processor environment);

- converting the electronic document from the intermediary file format into a word processor file format (see Column 2, Lines 3-10 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that it displays the stored document in a word processor); and
- transferring the electronic document formatting in the word processor format to equipment operating in the word processor environment (see Column 2, Lines 3-10 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that it displays the stored document in a word processor).

wherein the document formatting for each environment is stored independently in the intermediary format to enable independent editing of the document formatting for each environment (see Column 2, Lines 3-10; see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that discloses editing the stored document using either a word processor or a word processor with a Braille keypad; thus, the document formatting is “stored independently” to enable “independent editing” of the stored document).

Claim 17:

Ramsey discloses a method for converting an electronic document interchangeably between a format for use in a Braille environment and a format for use

in a word processor environment (see Figures 1-5; see Column 1, Line 1 through Column 10, Line 43; specifically, see Column 2, Lines 3-10 and Column 7, Lines 9-18), including:

- receiving input specifying an electronic document from an input device operating in the word processor environment (see Column 2, Lines 3-10; see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that it discloses a word processor);
- storing the electronic document in an intermediary file format which specifies the document formatting in both the Braille environment and the word processor environment (see Column 2, Lines 3-10; see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that it discloses both a word processor and a word processor with a Braille keypad, and other interactive computer Braille devices; a word processor stores documents in an “intermediary format” in that it converts the documents to either ASCII or Unicode when storing the documents; the stored document may be viewed in a word processor or “read” on the receiver; thus, the document is stored in an “intermediary format” that specifies the formats for both the Braille environment and the word processor environment);
- converting the electronic document from the intermediary file format into a Braille file format (see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that it allows users to read a word processing document by converting the stored file into Braille; also, the tactile

communication method discloses a word processor with a Braille keypad, and other interactive computer Braille devices; interactive computer Braille devices allow a user to process documents); and

- transferring the electronic document formatting in the Braille format to equipment operating in the Braille environment (see Column 2, Lines 3-10 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that it allows the user to “read” the stored document with the receiver; also, the tactile communication method discloses a word processor with a Braille keypad, and other interactive computer Braille devices; interactive computer Braille devices allow a user to process documents),

wherein the document formatting for each environment is stored independently in the intermediary format to enable independent editing of the document formatting for each environment (see Column 2, Lines 3-10; see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that discloses editing the stored document using either a word processor or a word processor with a Braille keypad; thus, the document formatting is “stored independently” to enable “independent editing” of the stored document).

Claim 18:

This claim merely recites an apparatus for performing the method of Claim 1. Thus, Ramsay discloses every element of this claim, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1.

Claim 19:

Ramsay discloses the apparatus of Claim 18, further including an input device for editing the electronic document formatting for each of the environments (see Column 2, Lines 3-10; see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that it discloses a word processor and a word processor with a Braille keypad; also, the tactile communication method discloses other interactive computer Braille devices; interactive computer Braille devices, which allow a user to process documents).

Claim 20:

This claim merely recites an apparatus for performing the method of Claim 5. Thus, Ramsay discloses every element of this claim, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 5.

Claim 22:

This claim merely recites an apparatus for performing the methods of Claims 13 and 16. Thus, Ramsay discloses every element of this claim, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 13 and 16.

Claim 23:

This claim merely recites an apparatus for performing the methods of Claims 11 and 17. Thus, Ramsay discloses every element of this claim, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 11 and 17.

Claims 24 and 25:

These claims merely recite an apparatus for performing the methods of Claims 12 and 15, respectively. Thus, Ramsay discloses every element of these claim, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 12 and 15.

Claim 26:

Ramsay discloses the apparatus according to Claim 18, further including an output device for rendering the electronic document in a visual, tactile or audible manner (see Column 2, Lines 3-10; see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that includes the receiver; also, the tactile communication method discloses other interactive computer Braille devices; interactive computer Braille devices, which allow a user to process documents).

Claim 27:

Ramsey discloses an apparatus which enables use of an electronic document interchangeably between a Braille and a word processor environment (see Figures 1-5;

see Column 1, Line 1 through Column 10, Line 43; specifically, see Column 2, Lines 3-10 and Column 7, Lines 9-18), including:

- at least one document input device operating in the Braille environment for entering an electronic document into the apparatus (as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 6 and 16, the tactile communication apparatus discloses this limitation);
- a storage device for storing the electronic document in an intermediary file format which specifies the document formatting in both the Braille environment and the word processor environment (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 16, the tactile communication apparatus discloses this limitation);
- a translator for converting the electronic document from the intermediary file format into a word processor file format (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 16, the tactile communication apparatus discloses this limitation) compatible for use with word processor equipment operating in the word processor environment (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 10, the tactile communication apparatus discloses this limitation); and
- a communication device for transferring the document between the storage device and the word processor equipment (see Column 2, Lines 3-10; see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that it includes a word processor, which allows the user to load and edit the stored document; thus, the word processor includes a “communication device”

for transferring the document between the "storage device" and the "word processor equipment"); and

- an editing device for editing the document formatting for each of the environments (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 16, the tactile communication apparatus discloses this limitation),

wherein the document formatting for each environment is stored independently in the intermediary file format to enable independent editing of the document formatting for each environment (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 16, the tactile communication apparatus discloses this limitation).

Claim 28:

Ramsey discloses an apparatus which enables use of an electronic document interchangeably between a Braille and a word processor environment (see Figures 1-5; see Column 1, Line 1 through Column 10, Line 43; specifically, see Column 2, Lines 3-10 and Column 7, Lines 9-18), including:

- at least one document input device operating in the word processor environment for entering an electronic document into the apparatus (as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 8 and 17, the tactile communication apparatus discloses this limitation);
- a storage device for storing the electronic document in an intermediary file format which specifies the document formatting in both the Braille environment and the

word processor environment (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 17, the tactile communication apparatus discloses this limitation);

- a translator for converting the electronic document from the intermediary file format into a Braille file format (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 17, the tactile communication apparatus discloses this limitation) compatible for use with Braille equipment operating in the word processor environment (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 11, the tactile communication apparatus discloses this limitation); and
- a communication device for transferring the document between the storage device and the Braille equipment (see Column 2, Lines 3-10; see Column 7, Lines 9-18 – the tactile communication method discloses this limitation in that it includes a word processor with a Braille keypad and other interactive computer Braille devices, which allow a user to process documents; thus, the word processor with a Braille keypad, and the other interactive Braille devices, include a “communication device” for transferring the document between the “storage device” and the “Braille equipment”); and
- an editing device for editing the document formatting for each of the environments (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 17, the tactile communication apparatus discloses this limitation),

wherein the document formatting for each environment is stored independently in the intermediary format to enable independent editing of the document formatting for each

environment (as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 17, the tactile communication apparatus discloses this limitation).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 14 and 21 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramsay.

Claim 14:

As indicated in the above discussion, Ramsay discloses every element of Claim 1:

Ramsay fails to expressly disclose transmitting the document to another computer. However, the examiner takes Official Notice that it was well-known by one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to transfer a document, stored on one computer, to another computer for the purpose of allowing a remote computer user to view the document.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Ramsay, to include

transmitting the document to another computer for the purpose of allowing a remote computer user to view the document.

Claim 21:

This claim merely recites an apparatus for performing the method of Claim 14. Thus, Ramsay discloses/teaches every element of this claim, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 14.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 29-33 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Claims 29, 32 and 33:

The closest prior art is Ramsay (US 6,230,135). Ramsay discloses a system that allows a user to process a document in a word processing environment and a Braille environment. The system can transfer documents from one environment to the other and make the necessary conversions during the transmission.

The system also discloses an "intermediary" file format in that, anytime a document is stored in a word processor, the document is saved in either ASCII or Unicode. Subsequently, whenever the document is loaded into the word processor in

either the word processor environment or the Braille environment, the "intermediary" file format is converted into the appropriate format for "viewing" the document.

However, the prior art fails to disclose or suggest an "intermediary" file format that: 1) stores the document, including the document content that is conditional on the environment in which it is being used, and 2) allows conversion of the "intermediary" file format into a "destination" file format that permits the user to edit the document within either the word processor environment or the Braille environment, including the content that is conditional on the environment in which it is being used.

Claims 30 and 31:

These claims are dependent upon Claim 29 and are thus allowable.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7 February 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Arguments for Claim 1:

Applicant argues that Ramsay fails to disclose converting between a Braille document editing environment and a word processing document editing environment without the loss of "document formatting." Applicant argues further that Ramsay fails to disclose document editing, particularly document editing in either a Braille environment

or a word processing environment and conversion between the environments. See *Applicant's Response* – Page 22, sixth paragraph through Page 23, first partial paragraph.

The examiner disagrees.

The relevant claim language, in regard to both of Applicant's arguments, recites: "converting the electronic document from the intermediary file format into a destination file format adapted for editing in the second of the environments" (see Claim 1, Lines 7-8). As indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Ramsay discloses this limitation in that the system discloses: 1) inputting documents using a word processor, a word processor with a Braille keypad, and other interactive computer Braille devices (see Column 2, Lines 3-10; see Column 7, Lines 9-18); 2) storing documents in an "intermediary" file format using a word processor on a computer (the system discloses this in that the word processor convert the documents to either ASCII or Unicode when storing the documents); and 3) converting documents from the "intermediary" file format into a "destination" file format adapted for editing in either a word processing environment or a Braille environment (the system discloses this in that documents may be loaded from memory into either environment and edited within that environment).

The system in Ramsay can convert a document from one environment to the other and allow a user to edit the document within that environment. Thus, no "document formatting" is lost during the conversion. Moreover, the feature upon which Applicant relies (i.e., the "loss" of "document formatting") is not recited in the rejected claim. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from

the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Arguments for Claim 18:

Applicant argues that Ramsay fails to disclose an intermediate storage file format. Applicant provides no analysis of the cited prior art in the context of the recited claim language and how the recited claim language distinguishes the present invention from the cited prior art. See *Applicant's Response* – Page 23, second full paragraph.

The examiner disagrees.

Firstly, Applicant's argument fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because it amounts to a general allegation that the claim defines a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claim patentably distinguishes it from the reference. Simply stating that certain limitations of a claim are not disclosed in the cited reference with no analysis of how the specific language of each limitation is distinguishable from the subject matter disclosed in the cited reference fails to meet the requirement of 37 CFR 1.111(b) that Applicant "specifically [point] out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references." Instead, Applicant simply argues, "it's not there."

Secondly, Ramsay discloses an intermediate storage file format, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1 and the above discussion.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is (571) 272-4137. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

WDH
May 27, 2005


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100